DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 822 HE 008 458

AUTHOR Foster, Margaret E.; And Others
TITLE Commuterism: Student Affairs Staff Attitudes Toward Students Living Off-Campus. Research Report No. 3-76.
INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Counseling Center.
PUB DATE Jun 76
NOTE 19p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
AVAILABLE FROM Counseling Center, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; *Commuting Students; Comparative Analysis; *Higher Education; Models; Residential Patterns; *Student College Relationship; *Student Personnel Workers
IDENTIFIERS SAS C; *Situational Attitude Scale Commuters; *University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

The Situational Attitude Scale - Commuters (SAS-C) was employed to measure attitudes of student affairs professionals toward commuting students at the University of Maryland, College Park. Two forms of the SAS-C were randomly assigned. Both contained the same 10 situations and bipolar responses, except a term equivalent to students-living-off-campus was inserted into each situation in Form A, while Form B contained a term defining a student living on-campus. Of the 100 items analyzed, 16 items significantly discriminated between the two samples and respondents tended to feel more negative toward commuting students. It was concluded that place of residence was a significant variable in accounting for differences between the two samples, and that prejudice toward commuters does exist and can be measured. Chickering's developmental variables were used as a conceptual framework for understanding dimensions along which commuting and resident students may be viewed differently. A six-stage model oriented toward reducing or eliminating commuterism was also outlined. (Author/LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131822

COUNSELING CENTER

Office of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

College Park, Maryland

HE008458

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

COMMUTERISM: STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENTS LIVING OFF-CAMPUS

Margaret E. Foster, William E. Sedlacek,
Mark W. Hardwick, and Anne E. Silver

Research Report # 3-76

Sponsored by
Office of Commuter Student Affairs
University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland
6-76

The computer time for this project was supported in full through the facilities of the Computer Science Center of the University of Maryland.

COUNSELING CENTER
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
COLLEGE PARK, MARYLAND

COMMUTERISM: STUDENT AFFAIRS STAFF ATTITUDES TOWARD STUDENTS LIVING OFF-CAMPUS

Margaret E. Foster, William E. Sedlacek, Mark W. Hardwick, and Anne E. Silver

Research Report #3-76

SUMMARY

Do prejudicial attitudes exist toward students living off-campus? Can attitudes toward commuting students be measured? Is institutional discrimination operating to the disadvantage of commuters? This investigation was designed to begin to answer these and related questions.

The Situational Attitude Scale - Commuters (SAS-C) was employed to measure attitudes of Student Affairs professionals toward commuting students at the University of Maryland, College Park. Two forms of the SAS-C were randomly assigned to the respondents. Both forms contained the same 10 situations and bipolar responses except a term equivalent to students living off-campus was inserted into each situation in Form A, while Form B contained a term defining a student living on-campus.

Of the 100 items analyzed, 16 items significantly discriminated between the two samples and respondents tended to feel more negative toward commuting students. It was concluded that place of residence was a significant variable in accounting for differences between the two samples. The results of the study, therefore, suggest that prejudice toward commuters does exist and can be measured.

Chickering's developmental variables were utilized as a conceptual framework for understanding dimensions along which commuting and resident students may be viewed differently. Also, a six stage change model oriented toward reducing or eliminating commuterism was outlined.

Does "commuterism" exist among the professional staff at a large urban university? If administrators and faculty members do hold prejudicial attitudes toward commuters, an awareness of this is critical since it may be possible that differential treatment and expectations exist. Since several investigations (e.g. Astin and Panos, 1970; Chickering and Kuper, 1971) have revealed differential social and educational outcomes between resident and commuting students, might these differences be a function of (in a self-fulfilling prophecy effect) differential treatment stemming from prejudicial attitudes toward commuters?

Since no controlled studies of prejudicial attitudes toward commuters appear in the literature, a review of studies of prejudice in general follows.

In recent years much attention has been focused on prejudicial attitudes. Prejudice has been defined by a number of authorities. Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1973) defines it as an irrational attitude of hostility directed against an individual, group or race or their supposed characteristics. Hesburgh in Glock and Siegelman (1969) suggests that prejudice means passing detrimental or negative judgement on persons or groups without sufficient evidence. Allport (1958) says it is avertive or hostile attitudes toward a person who belongs to a group simply because he belongs to that group, and is therefore presumed to have the objectionable quality ascribed to the group. On the other hand, Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) define prejudice or racism as action taken by one individual toward another which results in negative outcomes because the other person is identified with a certain group. The group may be racial, cultural, sexual, ideological, etc.

Additional attitudinal studies conducted by Sedlacek, Brooks, Christensen,

Harway and Merritt (1976) extended the investigation of racism to include sexism, which they conceptualized to operate as a specific case of the generic process of racism. The current investigation further expands the studies of racism and sexism to include a new concept called "commuterism". Defining sexism (and commuterism) as examples of racism has practical utility, suggests Sedlacek et. al. (1976) since the objective is to understand a process which we can apply to any group which we suspect is being discriminated against.

Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) suggest that most people have negative attitudes toward other races or cultural groups, and these attitudes can be measured and analyzed. In their efforts to operationalize and assess prejudicial attitudes, Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) developed an instrument - The Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) - to measure the attitudes of whites toward blacks. To provide a racial context and make psychological withdrawal difficult, the SAS contains 10 personal and social situations with some relevance to a racial response. Each situation is followed by 10 bipolar semantic differential scales (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957) making a total of 100 items. Two forms, A and B, were created each containing the same situation and bipolar scales with the exception that the word "black" appeared in each situation in Form B. The two forms are then randomly distributed to two samples with one group receiving Form A and one group receiving Form B. The subjects are unaware that different forms are being distributed. To achieve some basis for comparison, differences in mean responses to each of the forms are compared.

The SAS methodology has been employed in assessing attitudes toward a variety of groups and situations including minorities in several countries (Brooks, Sedlacek and Chaples 1974; Forrer, Sedlacek and Agarie - in press), student

attitudes toward protest (Hopple, 1976) and women in nontraditional roles (Herman and Sedlacek, 1973). There is some evidence that may be interpreted to suggest that students living off-campus are viewed as an outgroup or second class when compared to resident students. A strong indication that prejudicial attitudes may be operating toward commuters is seen as one surveys that portion of the literature which has compared resident and commuter students and perpetuated the image of the commuter as relatively disadvantaged (Chickering, 1974). Chickering, in collaboration with the American Council on Education (Astin and Panos, 1970) has collected an extensive amount of data gathered from thousands of students throughout all types of collegiate institutions. Chickering and Kuper (1971) conclude that, in simplest terms, differences between resident and commuting students are the differences between the haves and the have-nots. In general, it is reported that residents have higher incomes and obtain more education. Further, residents are said to achieve higher GPA's in high school and higher scores on aptitude tests. Their degree aspirations are said to be higher and their average age lower. They enter college with broader and more liberal interests in national and world affairs, are more autonomous, and are purported to be less concerned about financial problems and materialistic success. Other investigators such as Kysar (1964), who reviewed mental health differences between commuters and residents, and Stark (1965), who explored the extent of financial, employment, home, and family problems among commuters and residents, have perpetuated the tendency to place the commuter at the lower end of the continuum along many dimensions.

The purpose of the present study is to measure and analyze attitudes toward commuters.

Method

The Situational Attitude Scale - Commuters (SAS-C) was employed to measure attitudes of Student Affairs professionals toward commuting students at the University of Maryland, College Park (see Table 1). This instrument is an adaptation of and follows the format of the Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) Situational Attitude Scale (SAS). Modified to provide a "commuter" context, the SAS-C contains ten personal and social situations involving students in which "place of residence" (on versus off-campus) might be a variable in reacting to the situation. Two forms of the SAS-C were developed. Each form contained the same situations and bipolar responses except that a term equivalent to students living off-campus was inserted into each situation in Form A, while Form B contained a term defining a student living on-campus. Differences between Forms A and B were determined, using *t* at the .05 level.

The entire Student Affairs professional staff (N=52) (i.e., a position requiring at least a Master's level of education) were mailed the SAS-C questionnaire. Subjects were randomly assigned either form A or form B. Forty-seven subjects (90%) returned their questionnaires. The respondents were 49% male and 51% female, and departments were represented as follows: 30% Health Center, 47% Counseling Center, 6% Resident Life, 4% Student Union, 4% Campus Activities, 2% Orientation, 2% Operations, 2% Veterans' Services, and 2% Office of Judicial Affairs. Of the forty-seven returned questionnaires, 4 were eliminated due to excessive omission of items (greater than 10%). This resulted in 19 usable form A questionnaires and 24 usable form B instruments.

Results and Discussion

Of the 100 items analyzed, 16 items significantly discriminated between the samples (Table 2). Sakoda, Cohen and Beall (1954) indicate that about 9 tests would be expected to be significant at .05 level by chance. Since this investiga-

tion resulted in 16 significant tests, it can generally be concluded that place of residence is a significant variable in accounting for differences between the two samples.

Form A means were consistently more negative in situation I (orientation advisor) and IV (working - lunch conversation). More specifically, student affairs personnel felt toward commuters, as compared to resident students: uncomfortable, displeased, angry, unfavorable, disturbed, skeptical, and bad toward a freshman advisor who has never lived on campus; and anxious, indignant and disturbed at having a commuter student sit down and begin a conversation while the respondent was eating lunch and contemplating a research proposal.

In situation IX (dates student) student affairs staff were more supsicious and interested in their daughter dating a commuter as opposed to a resident. Respondents also tended to feel distant toward a commuter tutoring their son (situation II) and unaccepting of a commuter borrowing a book (situation VII), and surprised at a commuter joining the Peace Corps (situation V). Situations III (student assistantship), VIII (demonstration) and X (chairman of homecoming) showed no significant differences.

One interesting conceptual framework which may help to integrate the findings of this study and suggest dimensions along which commuters and residents may be viewed differently is Chickering's (1969) hierarchy of developmental vectors. Chickering suggests that growth among adolescents proceeds dynamically, sequentially, hierarchically beginning with achieving competence and progressing along the areas of managing emotions, becoming autonomous, establishing identity, freeing interpersonal relations, clarifying purposes and developing integrity. The investigators in this study suggest that the 10 situations employed in the SAS-C can be loosely related to Chickering's 7 vectors. For example, it appears reasonable to suggest that the issue of competency could be relevant in determining attitudes toward

orientation advisors (situation I). That is, it would be most important that an orientation advisor be intellectually, academically, and interpersonally skilled or competent. Secondly, the vector of freeing interpersonal relations might be one variable affecting one's attitude toward a student who sits down and begins a conversation during a work-lunch session (situation IV). Also trusting a student with a book (situation VII) could involve clarifying purposes or developing integrity. Hence, since commuters were viewed negatively in these three situations, it could be suggested that commuters are generally viewed as less competent and not as mature in interpersonal relations, or having less integrity than resident students. However, while commuters may be viewed as less mature along certain growth dimensions, they may be viewed as comparable to residents along such dimensions outlined by Chickering as autonomy (situation III, student working independently), clarifying purpose (situation V, student drops college and joins the Peace Corp.), and in managing emotions (situation VIII, students stage demonstration). The autonomy vector is an especially interesting issue relevant to commuters. Bishop and Snyder (1976) and George (1971) have provided data indicating that commuters rely on themselves as sources of help and appear more self-reliant than students who live on campus.

Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that prejudice toward commuters does, to a limited degree, exist. And secondly, it appears that the Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) SAS methodology is useful in assessing these attitudes.

The findings of this study provide additional support to that portion of the literature which has found the commuting student to be "disadvantaged," (e.g., Chickering, 1974; Kysar, 1964; and Stark, 1965). Since it was found in this investigation that prejudicial attitudes toward commuters appear to exist, and the literature suggests that commuters experience disadvantaged outcomes in institutions

of higher education, it seems reasonable to conclude that commuters may suffer some form of institutional discrimination.

While some inferences may be drawn from the findings, conclusions need to be viewed with some caution. For example, the SAS-C deals with feelings expressed on a paper and pencil instrument. There are no data provided on overt behavioral differences among subjects. Secondly, while the original SAS has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of attitudes of whites toward blacks, extending the SAS methodology to measure attitudes toward such groups as women and commuters is at an early stage of development. Also, since only 16 out of 100 items on the SAS-C differentiated between attitudes toward commuters versus resident students, the SAS-C would need further validation, although a larger sample would likely show more significant differences since many mean differences were in a negative direction although not significant.

What can we do about it?

Now that it has been-demonstrated that prejudicial attitudes are operating toward commuters, at least at the University of Maryland, an important question is - can we do anything about it? One possibility of daling with prejudice might be to develop workshops or conferences designed toward changing stereotypes toward commuters. Since there is evidence (e.g., Foster, Sedlacek & Hardwick, 1975; Harrington, 1972) that commuters are not disadvantaged relative to resident students, it would appear that there is material available to refute existing negative stereotypes and to foster change, i.e., that commuterism can be reduced or eliminated.

Sedlacek (1974) and Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) have developed a six-stage model for eliminating racism based on their research and experience in a number of settings. The change model is outcome oriented - that is the intent is to reduce or eliminate racism and not to have people feel good about it.

Secondly, the model is hierarchical and it appears best to work through the six stages in sequential order. The stages in the model and a few key points in each are cited below:

Stage I: Cultural, Racial and Sexual Differences: (1) Cultural, racial and sexual differences do exist; they should be openly discussed and understood by all. (2) Differences should be approached and presented positively, in and out of the classroom. Stage II: How Racism Operates: (1) Individual racism is action taken by one individual toward another, which results in negative outcomes, because the other person is identified with a certain group. The group may be racial, cultural, sexual, ideological, etc. This definition should include a group such as commuters. (2) Institutional racism is action taken by a social system or institution which results in negative outcomes for members of a certain group or groups. Stage III: Examining Racist Attitudes: (1) Most people have negative attitudes toward other races and cultural groups. (2) Racist attitudes can be measured and analyzed. The SAS, and presumably, the SAS-C, has demonstrated this. Stage IV: Sources of Racial Attitudes: (1) We all hold stereotypes that determine how we feel and act toward other groups. (2) Teachers and educational personnel tend to expect less from minority students. Stage V: Changing Behavior: What Can Be Done? (1) Goals must be stated to provice directions for change. (2) Strategies are separate from goals in that they are ways of accomplishing goals. Stage VI: Changing Behavior: How It Can Be Done: (1) The only test of a strategy is whether it works. (2) Most limitations to effective change are self-imposed.

Since there is evidence that this change model does work and commuterism can be viewed as a specific case of prejudgment, one possibility in dealing with commuterism would be to adapt the Sedlacek-Brooks model to reduce or eliminate commuterism.

It is hoped that information and methods discussed in this article will provoke both thought and action among readers.

References

Allport, G.W. The nature of prejudice. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1958.

Astin, A.W., Panos, R.J. Institutional selectivity and institutional outcomes. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1970.

Bishop, J.B. and Snyder, G.S. Commuters and Residents: Pressures, helps, and psychological services. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1976, 17, 232-235.

Brooks, G.C., Jr., Sedlacek, W.E. and Chaples, E.A. A cross-cultural comparison of Danish and U.S. attitudes toward minority groups. Research in Higher Education. 1974, 2, 207-220.

Chickering, A.W. Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1969.

Chickering, A.W. Commuting versus resident students. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1974.

Chickering, A.W. and Kuper, F. Them that has, gets. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Forrer, S.E., Sedlacek, W.E., and Agarie, N. Racial attitudes of Japanese university students. Research in Higher Education (in press).

Foster, M.E., Sedlacek, W.E., and Hardwick, M.W. A comparison of dependent commuters, independent commuters, and resident students. Counseling Center, Research Report #8-75, University of Maryland, College Park, 1975.

George, R.C. Resident or commuter: A study of personality differences. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1971, 12, (3), 216-219.

Harrington, T.F. The literature on the commuting student. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1972, 13, 546-550.

Herman, M.H., and Sedlacek, W.E. Sexist attitudes among male university students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1973, 14, 544-548.

Hesburgh, T.M. "Foreword". In C.Y. Glock and E. Siegelman (eds.), Prejudice, U.S.A. New York: Praeger, 1969.

Hopple, G.W. A new scale for measuring college student attitudes toward protest. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1976, 17, 211-214.

Kysar, J.E. Mental health in an urban commuter university. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1964, 11, 472-483.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J. and Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Sakoda, J.M., Cohen, E.H., and Beall, G. Test of significance for a series of statistical tests. Psychological Bulletin, 1954, 51, 172-175.

Sedlacek, W.E. Racism in society: A behavioral model for change. Leonia, N.J.: Behavioral Sciences Tape Library, 197[illegible] (No. 82220).

Sedlacek, W.E., and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Situational Attitude Scale (SAS) Manual. Chicago, Illinois: Natresources, Inc., 1972.

Sedlacek, W.E., and Brooks, G.C., Jr. Racism in American education: A model for change. Chicago, Illinois: Nelson Hall, 1976.

Sedlacek, W.E., Brooks, G.C., Jr., Christensen, K.C., Harway, M. and Merritt, M.S. Racism and sexism: A comparison and contrast. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans Administrators and Counselors, 1976, 39, 119-127.

Stark, M. Commuter and residence hall students compared. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 44, 277-281.

Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G and C. Merriam Co., 1973.

TABLE I

Instructions and Situations from the Situation Attitude Scale - Commuters

INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire is designed to measure how people think and feel about a number of academic, social and personal situations. It is not a test, so there are no right or wrong answers. The questionnaire is annonymous, so please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME.

Each item or situation is followed by 10 descriptive word scales. Your task is to select, for each descriptive scale, the rating which best describes YOUR feelings toward the item.

Sample item: Your daughter flunks her first exam.

empathetic 'A' B 'C 'D' E 'angry

You would indicate the direction and extent of your feelings (e.g., you might select B) by circling your choice 'B'. If you do not have a daughter, place yourself in the situation as best you can and respond to all items.

MAKE EACH ITEM A SEPARATE AND INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT. Respond as honestly as you can without puzzling over individual items.

SITUATIONS

1. Your daughter's freshman orientation advisor is a senior who has never lived on campus.	1. Your daughter's freshman orientation advisor is a senior who has lived on campus.
2. Your son is taking his first accounting test after having been tutored by a classmate living off-campus.	2. Your son is taking his first accounting test after having been tutored by a classmate living in the dorms.
3. You are allocated money for a student assistship that would require the student to work under little supervision and generate creative items for your organization. Only students living off-campus apply for the position.	3. You are allocated money for a student assistantship that would require the student to work under little supervision and generate creative items for your organization. Only students living on campus apply for the position.
4. You are eating your lunch and contemplating a research proposal when a commuter student sits down at your table and begins a conversation.	4. You are eating your lunch and contemplating a research proposal when a resident student sits down at your table and begins a conversation.
5. A student who has lived at home drops out of college to join the Peace Corps.	5. A student who has lived in the dorm drops out of college to join the Peace Corps.
6. A student requests a two-week extension on a paper because she has decided to move out of her home.	6. A student requests a two-week extension on a paper because she has decided to move out of her dorm.
7. A student asks to borrow one of your "hard to come by" books so that she might read it in her apartment overnight.	7. A student asks to borrow one of your "hard to come by" books so that she might read it in her dorm overnight.
8. A group of commuters stage a demonstration demanding more money for their programs.	8. A group of resident students stage a demonstration demanding more money for their programs.
9. Your daughter is very depressed about school; she begins to date a university student living in your neighborhood.	9. Your daughter is very depressed about school; she begins to date a university student living on campus.
10. The chairman elected to sponsor Homecoming is a junior, living at home.	10. The chairman elected to sponsor Homecoming is a junior, living on campus.

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and t-tests for Forms A and B*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A(N= 19) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B(N= 24) MEAN	S.D.	t***
	I. Freshman Orientation Advisor					
1	comfortable-uncomfortable	1.74	1.15	.71	.99	3.14
2	displeased-pleased	1.95	.91	2.92	.88	3.53
3	cold-warm	2.37	.89	2.71	.81	1.31
4	worried-calm	2.53	1.12	3.00	.93	1.51
5	angry-content	2.47	1.17	3.08	.78	2.05
6	favorable-unfavorable	2.16	.96	.92	.83	4.55
7	undisturbed-disturbed	1.79	1.27	.96	1.04	2.36
8	trusting-skeptical	1.95	1.27	1.17	.96	2.30
9	good-bad	1.89	.88	1.17	.76	2.92
10	involved-uninvolved	1.63	1.17	1.58	1.02	.14
	II. Tutored by a Classmate					
11	good-bad	1.26	.81	.92	.88	1.33
12	displeased-pleased	2.89	.88	3.08	.88	.70
13	surprised-not surprised	2.67	.97	2.79	1.06	.39
14	hopeless-hopeful	2.63	.76	3.08	.78	1.91
15	favorable-unfavorable	1.11	.83	1.08	.83	.11
16	expected-disappointed	1.71	.59	1.63	.65	.41
17	close-distant	2.00	.35	1.46	.78	3.00
18	smarter-dumber	1.65	.79	1.65	.57	.02
19	angry-content	2.56	.92	2.96	.81	1.51
20	suspicious-trusting	2.79	.92	3.04	.81	.96
	III. Student Assistantship					
21	good-bad	1.89	1.10	1.92	1.53	.05
22	skeptical-trusting	2.58	1.02	1.88	1.26	1.97
23	cautious-unguarded	2.11	.94	1.54	1.02	1.86
24	receptive-unreceptive	1.21	.98	1.46	1.29	.70
25	serious-humorous	1.53	.77	1.63	.97	.36
26	disturbed-undistrubed	2.37	1.07	2.08	1.25	.79
27	threatened-neutral	2.79	1.03	3.17	1.24	1.07
28	interested-disinterested	1.21	.92	.78	.85	1.57
29	favorable-unfavorable	1.53	1.07	1.50	1.25	.07
30	bored-excited	2.32	.75	2.50	.72	.82
	IV. Working-Lunch Conversation					
31	anxious-at ease	2.58	.96	3.42	.83	3.07
32	indignant-understanding	2.47	.77	3.21	.93	2.76
33	suspicious-trusting	2.63	.83	2.83	1.01	.70
34	flattered-offended	1.42	.77	1.42	.78	.02
35	serious-humorous	1.84	.69	1.83	.92	.03
36	ridiculous-important	2.58	.61	2.54	.59	.20
37	bad-good	2.53	.91	2.92	.78	1.52
38	surprised-not surprised	1.47	.96	2.17	1.24	2.00
39	undisturbed-distrubed	1.84	.90	1.17	1.17	2.08
40	close-distant	1.95	.52	1.54	.93	1.80

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)

**See Table 1 for complete situation.

***All t values larger than 2.02 are significant beyond .05 (2-tailed test).

TABLE 2

Means, Standard Deviations and t-tests for Forms A and B*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A(N= 19) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B(N= 24) MEAN	S.D.	t***
	V. Drops College for Peace Corps					
41	favorable-unfavorable	1.63	.76	1.46	.98	.63
42	bad-good	2.32	.67	2.67	.76	1.58
43	unconcern[illegible]-concerned	2.58	1.02	2.38	.92	.[illegible]9
44	rejecting-accepting	2.84	.90	3.17	.76	1.28
45	empathy-apathy	1.21	.71	.79	.78	1.82
46	surprised-not surprised	2.05	.78	2.58	.83	2.14
47	hopeless-hopeful	2.68	.82	2.92	.97	.83
48	anxious-calm	2.26	.93	2.83	.96	1.95
49	displeased-pleased	2.16	.60	2.58	.97	1.76
50	cold-warm	2.42	.61	2.83	.82	1.83
	VI. Requests Extension on Paper					
51	empathetic-apathetic	1.00	.88	1.46	.88	1.69
52	stubborn-yielding	2.63	.76	1.96	1.00	2.43
53	unconcerned-concerned	3.05	.62	2.96	.69	.46
54	happy-sad	2.16	.60	1.83	.70	1.60
55	trusting-suspicious	1.63	1.01	1.75	1.03	.38
56	unfavorable-favorable	2.16	.90	1.83	1.01	1.10
57	not surprised-surprised	2.05	.52	1.92	1.14	.52
58	disappointed-pleased	1.79	.42	1.83	.92	.21
59	hostile-indifferent	2.42	.61	2.13	1.15	1.08
60	cold-warm	2.47	.70	1.96	1.12	1.85
	VII. Borrow a Book					
61	complimented-insulted	1.11	.81	1.33	.76	.95
62	angered-overjoyed	2.47	.61	2.25	.85	.97
63	suspicious-trusting	2.74	.81	2.43	1.12	.98
64	cooperative-uncooperative	.84	.69	1.38	1.25	1.78
65	threatened-neutral	2.84	.96	2.57	1.31	.77
66	comfortable-uncomfortable	1.32	.89	1.67	1.17	1.09
67	unfavorable-favorable	2.89	.66	2.29	1.30	1.97
68	close-distant	1.47	.77	1.83	1.01	1.28
69	unaccepting-accepting	2.33	.62	3.05	1.24	2.48
70	empathy-indifference	1.16	.90	1.42	1.25	.76
	VIII. Demonstration					
71	favorable-unfavorable	1.79	1.13	1.71	1.23	.22
72	apathetic-empathetic	2.37	.90	2.83	.78	1.77
73	unresentful-resentful	1.74	.99	1.33	1.23	1.23
74	proud-indignant	1.95	.78	1.79	.83	.63
75	indifferent-hostile	1.74	.93	1.78	.90	.16
76	unjustified-justified	2.16	1.02	2.50	.83	1.21
77	humorous-serious	2.42	.84	2.17	.92	.94
78	anxious-clam	2.11	.99	2.54	1.18	1.29
79	disappointed-elated	1.68	.89	2.13	1.04	1.48
80	unexpected-expected	2.21	1.08	2.38	.77	.58

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
**See Table 1 for complete situation.
***All t values larger than 2.02 are significant beyond .05 (2-tailed test).

Means, Standard Deviations and t-tests for Forms A and B*

ITEM NO.	SITUATIONS** BIPOLAR ADJECTIVE DIMENSION	FORM A (N=180) MEAN	S.D.	FORM B (N=185) MEAN	S.D.	t***
	IX. Dates Student					
81	bad-good	2.37	.68	2.42	1.18	.17
82	accepting-rejecting	1.21	.71	1.21	.98	.01
83	anxious-calm	2.37	.83	2.79	1.32	1.28
84	unconcerned-concerned	2.58	.90	2.29	1.23	.85
85	trusting-suspicious	1.00	.75	1.17	1.01	.60
86	interested-disinterested	.84	.69	.42	.65	2.07
87	threatened-neutral	2.58	.77	3.17	1.05	2.04
88	unresentful-resentful	1.26	.93	.96	1.08	.97
89	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.53	.91	2.79	1.29	.76
90	cold-warm	2.84	.83	3.04	1.12	.65
	X. Chairman of Homecoming					
91	pleased-displeased	1.42	.77	1.21	.80	.84
92	surprised-expected	1.79	.63	2.00	.80	.93
93	uncomfortable-comfortable	2.84	.77	3.90	.95	.91
94	trusting-suspicious	1.05	.78	.78	.85	1.06
95	accepting-rejecting	.95	.78	.65	.83	1.18
96	nervous-calm	2.63	.76	3.04	.98	1.50
97	distant-close	2.32	.75	2.13	.82	.76
98	involved-not involved	1.61	1.09	2.04	1.08	1.27
99	hopeless-hopeful	2.79	.92	2.96	.93	.59
100	cooperative-uncooperative	.89	.81	.70	.82	.79

*Scale A to E (Numerical equivalent, 0 to 4)
**See Table 1 for complete situation.
***All t values larger than 2.02 are significant beyond .05 (2-tailed test).